

RECEIVED

JUL 19 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20541

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: <JDStedman@aol.com>
To: A16.A16(RM-8648)
Date: [REDACTED]
Subject: Public Spectrum Rights

This is written for reasons that the FCC Commissioners or others should want to learn more about the Apple NII Communications Commons proposal:

1. The Apple NII proposal raises the opportunity to consider a major new concept: how new technology can allow many more users to share the common radio spectrum at lower cost and regulatory burden.
2. This is a wake up call from the technical community to the FCC to draw attention to the implications of the new digital signal processing communications technology.
3. With success the amount of available spectrum space could be greatly increased to improve our ability to apply electronic communications to societal sectors not cost effective today, nor likely to be feasible with the present regulatory trajectory.
4. Public shared access by all comers without complex licensing is both technically and economically superior to the present concept of auctioning off the public spectrum to the highest bidder.
5. While the funds received from the one time auction appear to be significant, they are economically counterproductive. The high front end costs of spectrum licensing is a major disincentive to new technology risk investments in new radio technology. (Initial venture capital investments can rarely be justified if greater than a few million dollars, an amount far less than the bid price of national frequencies.) Only very large companies seeking monopoly positions can afford the front end costs of the bidding game.
6. The one time funds received by government for selling off the public's spectrum is small compared to the long term revenue potential over time. It is a public policy of selling the goose that lays the golden eggs rather than the eggs over time.
7. To ignore this new input information means continuing to keep a range of new services from becoming cost feasible.
8. We believe the new technology alternatives are so compelling that it will be just a matter of time whether it is adopted or not. When the new technology is adopted, either earlier or later, the world will look back and credit the FCC Commissioners for their vision, or view them in retrospect with the same attitude as we view the old East Germany leadership for trying to maintain the status quo.

Jon D. Stedman -> <JDStedman@aol.com>
1201-92 Sycamore Terrace
Sunnyvale, CA 94086
408-247-6562

CC: A16.A16(RM-8653)

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List A B C D E

From: David Enos <ENOSD@ceb.ucop.edu>
To: 'RM-8648@fcc.gov' <RM-8648@fcc.gov>
Date: [REDACTED]
Subject: WinForum and Apple wireless NII Proposals

RECEIVED

JUL 19 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20541

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I strongly urge that both the WinForum and Apple wireless NII proposals be implemented to the fullest possible extent. It is ridiculous that a clearly public resource, our airwaves, are not actually available for public use.

-David Enos
Enosd@ceb.ucop.edu
577 Castro #204
SF, CA 94114

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List A B C D E

From: James Paisner <76470.1231@compuserve.com>
To: FCC <RM-8648@fcc.gov>
Date: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: RM-8648 AND PUBLIC ACCESS

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

In the Matter of RM-8653
Allocation of Spectrum in the 5 GHz Band to Establish a Wireless Component of the National Information Infrastructure

I am writing to urge you to establish a metropolitan-region free-spectrum public-domain component of this infrastructure.

I will leave it to those more technical than I to discuss details, but what I have learned of this issue convinces me that the FCC needs to act now to ensure access by all to what is after all a public property - the electromagnetic spectrum.

Sincerely,

James Paisner

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List A B C D E _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: David Enos <ENOSD@ceb.ucop.edu>
To: 'RM-8648@fcc.gov' <RM-8648@fcc.gov>
Date: [REDACTED]
Subject: WinForum and Apple wireless NII Proposals

JUL 19 1995

MAIL ROOM
JUL 19 1995

I strongly urge that both the WinForum and Apple wireless NII proposals be implemented to the fullest possible extent. It is ridiculous that a clearly public resource, our airwaves, are not actually available for public use.

-David Enos
Enosd@ceb.ucop.edu
577 Castro #204
SF, CA 94114

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List A B C D E

RECEIVED

JUL 19 1995

From: <JDStedman@aol.com>
To: A16.A16(RM-8648)
Date: [REDACTED]
Subject: Public Spectrum Rights

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

This is written for reasons that the FCC Commissioners or others should want to learn more about the Apple NII Communications Commons proposal:

1. The Apple NII proposal raises the opportunity to consider a major new concept: how new technology can allow many more users to share the common radio spectrum at lower cost and regulatory burden.
2. This is a wake up call from the technical community to the FCC to draw attention to the implications of the new digital signal processing communications technology.
3. With success the amount of available spectrum space could be greatly increased to improve our ability to apply electronic communications to societal sectors not cost effective today, nor likely to be feasible with the present regulatory trajectory.
4. Public shared access by all comers without complex licensing is both technically and economically superior to the present concept of auctioning off the public spectrum to the highest bidder.
5. While the funds received from the one time auction appear to be significant, they are economically counterproductive. The high front end costs of spectrum licensing is a major disincentive to new technology risk investments in new radio technology. (Initial venture capital investments can rarely be justified if greater than a few million dollars, an amount far less than the bid price of national frequencies.) Only very large companies seeking monopoly positions can afford the front end costs of the bidding game.
6. The one time funds received by government for selling off the public's spectrum is small compared to the long term revenue potential over time. It is a public policy of selling the goose that lays the golden eggs rather than the eggs over time.
7. To ignore this new input information means continuing to keep a range of new services from becoming cost feasible.
8. We believe the new technology alternatives are so compelling that it will be just a matter of time whether it is adopted or not. When the new technology is adopted, either earlier or later, the world will look back and credit the FCC Commissioners for their vision, or view them in retrospect with the same attitude as we view the old East Germany leadership for trying to maintain the status quo.

Jon D. Stedman -> <JDStedman@aol.com >
1201-92 Sycamore Terrace
Sunnyvale, CA 94086
408-247-6562

CC: A16.A16(RM-8653)

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List A B C D E _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JUL 19 1995

From: David Enos <ENOSD@ceb.ucop.edu>
To: 'RM-8648@fcc.gov' <RM-8648@fcc.gov>
Date: [REDACTED]
Subject: WinForum and Apple wireless NII Proposals

I strongly urge that both the WinForum and Apple wireless NII proposals be implemented to the fullest possible extent. It is ridiculous that a clearly public resource, our airwaves, are not actually available for public use.

-David Enos
Enosd@ceb.ucop.edu
577 Castro #204
SF, CA 94114

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List A B C D E